REMARKS

In response to the final Official Action of March 3, 2009, claims 1, 15, 23-25, 30, 35, and 39 have been amended in a manner which is believed not to raise new issues. Consequently, entry of this Amendment After Final is requested.

More specifically, the claims have been amended to shorten preambles, to correct grammatical issues, to change the expression "configured for" to "configured to", and to make clear in the independent claims that the invention is directed to detecting a latest operation relating to a source application, automatically tracing an item relating to said operation from said source application by a tracing application being common for all of said at least one source application, extracting at least one item from said operation, recording said item automatically into a list of traced and recorded items in a file of the tracing application, said list comprising traced and recorded items from various source applications, calling said file by the target application and selecting and pasting said one or more items to said target application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Office asserts at pages 2-7 that claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-30, 33, 34, and 37-39 are anticipated by US patent 6,205,928, Johnson. Johnson discloses a computer system having a QWERTY or similar type keyboard (i.e., keyboard with individual keys for each letter) and the use of hot keys (e.g., keyboard shortcuts) for selecting certain operations. Johnson discloses an automatic tracing of an operation, whereby data relating to the operation is automatically stored to an automatic address database (AAD) representing a "centralized clipboard". When data relating to a copied operation is desired to be pasted to a target application, hotkeys are used to determine which type of data is to be inserted (see e.g., Table 1 of Johnson at column 7). If an email address is desired to be pasted, then hotkeys e-e are used. Johnson's solution is not handy with mobile terminals because terminals have a limited number of keys and rather small displays compared to those of a computer.

It becomes clear from Johnson that the solution disclosed therein does not comprise any "tracing application" being common to the other applications the operations of which are being traced, as in the present application. For example, in Johnson at column 3, lines 20-28, it is disclosed that each platform (e.g., PC, PBX, pager) contains a platform dependent set of application programming interfaces (API's) for accessing the enterprise address book (AB) and writing information to the automatic addressing database (AAD). The address book is a single shared repository whereby each platform has a particular native communication to the address book. Likewise, the automatic addressing database is a single repository that is accessed from various components. Even though the AAD and the AB are common to the applications the operations of which are traced, the "tracing application" is not.

In addition, in order to carry out the solution of Johnson, data from the address book is always utilized. In Johnson (column 3, lines 29-35; column 4, lines 6-29) communication is received, and the identification (ID) of the caller (person making the communication) is used as a key to access data within an address book. This corresponding person's name and addressing information is retrieved and also written to the AAD. By using hotkeys or a user interface, the user is allowed to automatically retrieve address book data into an application running on the user's computer (Johnson, column 6, lines 54-57).

In the present invention, there is a tracing application carrying out the tracing operations from a variety of applications regardless of their type or their purpose (e.g., paragraph [0032], [0037]-[0041] of the published application). The tracing application as such operates as the centralized clipboard gathering all the items being traced and performing their classification. It is realized that the tracing application is common for all of the applications the operations of which are traced. The applications do not have to have their own functionality for tracing operations and items.

At paragraph [0036] of the published application of the present application and in Figure 5 thereof, it is further disclosed that after an operation is detected, an item (relating to that operation) is traced from the source application by the tracing application. In order to operate with the tracing application, no other data storages (as address book in

Johnson) are needed. The tracing application functions independently and keeps up its own records in a file.

The present claims, including claim 1, are now amended by a feature that an item is traced by means of a tracing application being common for all of said at least one source application. Although this feature (i.e., "common") is not explicitly mentioned in the disclosure, it becomes clear from the specification that there is one tracing application serving all the source applications. It is stated, for example at paragraph [0030] of the published application, that the method can be carried out by an independent software application program which is referred by a term "tracing application". It is therefore apparent that because the application discloses different types of applications and operations, but only "an independent tracing application", the tracing application must be common for all of the applications.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is not anticipated nor suggested by Johnson.

Independent claims 15, 30, and 39 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and, for similar reasons, are also neither anticipated nor suggested by Johnson.

Since each of the independent claims are believed to be allowable, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2, 3, 5-14, 16, 18-29, 33, 34, 37, and 38 are also neither anticipated or suggested by Johnson at least in view of such dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

At pages 7-9, claim 35 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson further in view of US patent application publication 2006/0155811, Goh, et al (hereinafter Goh). Furthermore, claim 36 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson further in view of US patent application publication 2005/0028008, Kumar. Claims 35 and 36 each depend from amended claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least in view of such dependency since neither Goh nor Kumar make up for the deficiencies in Johnson with respect to the features discussed above regarding independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Amendment After Final. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 1, 2009

_____

/Alfred A. Fressola/
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,550

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
    & ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955